CHAPTER 10

Nurturing pedagogical praxis through deliberative communication

Ragnhild Sandvoll, Andreas Bergh and Tone Dyrdal Solbrekke

Introduction

> I believe in deliberative communication as a public good. It involves some values and principles that I really want to stimulate among academics. But how do I go about it?

While indicating a degree of uncertainty regarding how to practise deliberative communication, the above statement from an experienced academic developer (AD) denotes a genuine commitment to introduce deliberative communication to her repertoire (see Chapter 3) as a pedagogical means for leading higher education as, and for, public good. Such ambition, resonates with the many researchers who have pointed out the need to critically investigate the formative aspects of different teaching and assessment practices (Sullivan & Rosin, 2008) in light of the purpose of higher education to educate students with a capacity to act in a professionally responsible manner in future work practice (Beck et al., 2015; Colby et al., 2011; Walker, 2018). Against this backdrop, this chapter analyses how the AD quoted above uses deliberative communication in practice as an approach to leading higher education as, and for, public good.

The specific case we explore is part of the AD's consultation work at the University of Oslo, and a consequence of an initiative taken by the deans of study at the Faculty of Dentistry who approached the AD for assistance in their ongoing work with academic development and transforming (improving) clinical supervision practices. The overall aim of the initiative is to develop more transparent supervision and assessment practices that support students' formation in becoming professionally responsible dentists. The expression "professionally responsible" emphasises the normative mandate that entrusts higher education institutions with the responsibility to provide society with highly skilled professionals, citizens and leaders who will work for both individual and public good (Solbrekke, 2007). The goal for the case studied here was to lead the process of developing formative assessment procedures communicating *what* to be evaluated, *how* and *why.* The intention, announced by the dean of study, was that more transparent procedures would contribute to the learning environment in which the students could grow personally and help them become professionally responsible dentists. However, creating learning situations that support such formation in clinical situations is challenging, and the Faculty turned to the AD for pedagogical support. The AD

has expertise in the field of educational leadership and professional education, with a specific interest in how university teaching may cultivate students' sense of professional responsibility (Solbrekke, 2007, 2008; Solbrekke & Sugrue, 2014). As the AD has been a consultant to the Faculty since 2012, and she had worked closely with both formal and informal educational leaders at several levels at the Faculty, they knew her quite well. Thus, the case represents an AD who is practising what Debowski (2014) defines as an equal partner rather than a centralist expert. The initiative taken to develop new assessment rubrics is a result of close collaboration between the AD and the faculty staff over time.

While such a role indicates trust in the AD and her expertise as a university pedagogue, it may also be indicative of how university leaders at different levels increasingly tend to delegate to ADs the leadership responsibility for transforming teaching practices (Stensaker et al., 2017; Taylor, 2005). Very rarely are new leadership initiatives from senior leaders applauded by all (Handal et al., 2014; Youngs, 2017). Rather they are often met with resistance or at least scepticism and must be negotiated to reach legitimate compromises in the tension between different interests (see Chapter 4). Such delegated responsibility implies brokering responsibilities to cope with possible tensions that may emerge in the web of commitments that leading educational processes embed (Fremstad et al., 2019; Handal et al., 2014). Finally, the different commitments must be negotiated with the AD's values and aspirations in order to reach legitimate compromises on how to lead the process. In this case it concerns how to reach a level of agreement needed to develop a more common assessment practice while also contributing to the knowledge and expertise of colleagues (Debowski, 2014).[i]

Against this backdrop, our intention is to gain more insight into the potential of and challenges with using deliberative communication as a pedagogical approach in leading academic development processes as, and for, public good.

The research questions are:

1) How does the AD, through deliberative communication, lead the process of academic development when developing formative assessment procedures to enhance professional responsibility?
2) What possibilities and challenges emerge in the process of leading?

The presentation of the case is structured as follows. We begin by situating the case within the ongoing work at the Faculty of Dentistry, and this is followed by a description of the method deployed to study the case. Thereafter, we provide an analysis of the findings structured by

first describing the AD's stated commitments and ambitions. Guided by the first research question we then present some substantive findings under three sub-headings. The final section identifies some implications of the case study for leading higher education as, and for, public good, which thus answers the second research question.

Contextualising the case

Being a professional programme, the dental education is regulated by a jurisdiction common to all professional education programmes in health, social work and education in Norway. This regulation defines the criteria for "suitability assessment" (skikkethetsvurdering) of students in eight bullet points (Norwegian Government, 2006)[ii]. "Suitability" is a concept used to describe whether a professional is behaving in a responsible way. In the context of professional education, it is used to indicate how educational leaders must determine whether or not a student is "suitable" as a student and will be "suitable" to work in a professionally responsible manner in the future. The regulation defines irresponsible behaviour in professional work and clarifies that, if a student performs unacceptably in light of one or more of the criteria (Norwegian Government, 2016), he or she runs the risk of being excluded from the programme, thus diminishing or losing the opportunity to be certified as a dentist. 'Suitability' in professional education therefore bears the same meaning as being professionally responsible (Solbrekke, 2007) and, as such, guides students on their trajectories towards becoming professionally responsible dentists. The focus on educating professionally responsible dentists entails "making educated professionals humans and socially responsible through its moral and cultural training towards a moral individualism" (Chapter 3, p. 3), thus a contribution as and for both private and public good.

As part of their efforts to develop more common assessment rubrics that support their students' holistic formation, the staff at the faculty had worked for more than three years with developing a shared template for clinical assessment, but struggled to reach legitimate compromise on what to include and how to use such a template. This is the stage of the process in which the AD got involved.

Based on the request to support them in the development of the template, the AD and the Faculty of Dentistry agreed on a "development project". While this "project" is an ongoing process at the time of writing this chapter the case study is restricted to activities that took place between May 2017 and March 2018. The context of the case is an annual introductory course in clinical supervision for professional dentists who are part-time *instructors* to

supervise student dentists in clinical work at the Faculty.[iii] We concentrate on the AD and her collaboration with one of the educational leaders hereafter described as the *supervisor.* This individual's responsibility was to supervise one group of five instructors, a group assigned the task of developing and testing a template for assessing students' knowledge, skills and attitudes in clinical work.

This template is a development of a previous one used by some instructors, but without any commitments that it be used by all instructors across the clinics. Thus, the faculty wanted to develop a new template that would guide all instructors on how to do formative assessment of students while also making the evaluation process more transparent and predictable for their students. This was a challenge, and also important in order to enhance the continuous assessment (*løpende skikkethetsvurdering)* process. In order to find a common base for the template, the AD introduced the "suitability regulation" to the leaders at the Faculty as a reference for the assessment template, and also to all participants and supervisors in the course in clinical supervision.

Methods

Consistent with the methodology of all the cases in this book we have applied an abductive and reflexive insider-outsider approach inspired by the principles of deliberative communication for the study of the case (see introduction to Part II for elaboration on the method). This implied active reflections among the critical friends/researchers and the AD on the complex dynamics between the AD, supervisor and instructors, and how to reach a legitimate compromise between the commitment of the AD to lead the process and the commitment to support the supervisor while not taking over her responsibility to lead the group meetings.

Table 10.1 summarises the empirical material for the study and how it is used for the case analysis.

Table 10.1: Methods and data sources

Informed consent was obtained from the supervisor and the instructors, and they were advised that they could withdraw at any time.

The AD and the supervisor met before and after every group meeting with the instructors, to discuss and reflect on the strategies the supervisor sought to use to encourage clinical supervision practices that nurture a sense of professional responsibility. In addition, the AD

participated in the group meetings together with the instructors and the supervisor, mainly to support the supervisor in her endeavour of leading the group work.

Due to the many layers of the case, (meetings between the AD and the supervisor in addition to four group meetings, all video recorded), the data are very rich and the analysis was conducted by the two researchers in several iterative steps (reading the log, watching the videos, categorising, reading relevant literature and returning to the material), followed by ongoing deliberations to reach agreement on the parts of the case that would be subject to more in-depth analysis. We decided to focus on group meetings where we identified situations illustrative of some of the tensions arising between the AD's different commitments.

In the next step of the analysis, we searched for sequences in which we identified dilemmas and challenges emerging when the AD used or attempted to use deliberative communication in her interactions with the supervisor and the instructors. The abductive analysis, inspired by Alvesson and Sköldberg (2000), created a dynamic process of data- and theory-driven modifications, while the iterative deliberations on interpretations between the two researchers, and the revisiting of the data material, prevented us from jumping to premature conclusions, a risk compounded by theory-laden expectations (Tjora, 2010).

Guided by the research questions, below we present and analyse illustrations from the case with the support of concepts and theories applied through the abductive process.

Leading through deliberative communication in a web of commitments

In the earliest conversation with her critical friends, the AD articulated a two-fold motivation for using deliberative communication. She said:

> First, I want to use deliberative communication to reach a legitimate compromise on a template to encourage formative assessment that nurtures students' holistic formation personally, professionally and as active citizens, and second, to gain experience and develop expertise in using deliberative communication in supervision and teaching generally to foster deliberative academic development as Kandlbinder defines it.[iv] (AD, August 2017).

The AD maintained that she wanted to use deliberative communication to encourage the academics to challenge each other's perspectives on what professional responsibility implies. She stated:

> Using deliberative communication might help the instructors to open up for different perspectives on how to enact formative assessment. It is important to allow all voices

equal space and respect in order to reach a legitimate compromise for a common assessment practices. (AD, August 2017)

This double ambition was a driving force for the AD in a case which represents several layers of commitments. She knew that the Faculty leaders trusted her to lead the process and pedagogically "qualify" the work with the assessment template, and to enact brokering if competing and conflicting values arose during the process. From an academic development perspective, she was committed to encourage the supervisor to find her own way of leading and supervising the instructors when they worked with the assessment template. This included a commitment to support the leaders in a discipline in which the AD was not expert, while also sharing her professional expertise as a pedagogue and leader within the field of academic development.

Her commitment to using deliberative communication as a pedagogy is revealed in the first planning meeting with the supervisor where she elaborated the principles of deliberative communication and argued that "deliberative communication is, in my view, a good way of promoting professional responsibility and in turn serve as a public good" (AD, August 2017). In the same meeting she encouraged the supervisor to try to use deliberative communication as a means of leading the group meetings with the instructors. Such ambition required that she endeavour to both supervise and role model how to make the group meetings a learning environment for both the supervisor and the instructors in which the principles of deliberative communication were followed. These principles stands for the idea of how to lead communication in a procedural way where different opinions and values are set against each other, to be discussed in a respectful way with a view to research consensus (see Chapter 3). This meant encouraging all instructors to speak out during the group meetings, respect and tolerate different perspectives while also reaching a legitimate compromise on the template. She was also very conscious of the commitment to the overall purpose of dental education. To her, this meant contributing to the development of an assessment template representing a legitimate compromise between promoting the formation of student dentists and professional responsibility, and the more instrumental needs to measure and evaluate students according to the regulatory requirements of "suitability assessment".[v]

The commitment to using deliberative communication was apparent in this case and was clearly articulated in the planning of the process, but what impact did it have on the AD's actual contribution to the interaction with the supervisor and instructors?

Deliberative communication as praxis: challenging the use of everyday language

In the group meetings, when the instructors, under supervision from the supervisor supported by the AD, worked to develop the template, a frequently raised topic was how language was used in both the template and the actual supervision of students. By asking critical questions, the AD encouraged the instructors to reflect on their understanding of concepts used in the draft, some of which were based on everyday language used to describe professional settings and, thus, could be imprecise. As an example, the AD pointed to the assessment template and said:

> Look at these conceptions for assessing students' professionalism: "being kind", "being relaxed" and "look like you are feeling confident". These concepts characterise students, but is it given that they are understood similarly among you instructors? And how may "being kind" be considered as a sign of professional responsibility? What is the meaning of the concept 'being confident', which is written in the format, compared with the concepts "evenly good" and "excellent"?

One of the instructors answered: "Well, I am not sure about the concept 'evenly good'. Then, is 'being confident' better?" Another instructor continued:

> "Being confident"—I have to admit that I think it is a very good concept. It shows that it is something beyond the assessment of the individual student, and it shows that there is a judgement based on several considerations. A dentist who is feeling confident is a dentist that can step up in the middle of a treatment and ask: "What am I really doing now"? And that, as I see it, is a professionally responsible dentist who is able to take a step backwards, stop and reflect on the clinical situation.

The AD challenged the instructors to reflect on their use of language, and in doing so, the instructors realised that they understood concepts used in the draft of the assessment template very differently. Aspiring to reach a shared understanding, the AD aimed at encouraging awareness of how concepts can be interpreted differently, yet may be open for change of meaning (Breivik, Fosse, & Rødnes, 2014) through interactions with others (Wertsch, 1991). She did not point to other, more concise conceptions; rather, she invited all the instructors to question and develop the concepts in the assessment template. Based on these discussions, they also changed some of the conceptions used in the assessment format. These deliberations also demonstrate that, apart from questioning the meaning of everyday terminology, it is necessary also to revisit such important language regularly. Otherwise, the routines of practice, the busyness of everyday interactions may ignore the more cerebral, reflective dimension inherent in praxis (see Chapters 1 and 11), thus reducing professional responsibility of instructors and supervisors to mere practical routines, ritual performance.

Among the instructors, a shared language can be considered important for discussions of how to assess students' professional skills and attitudes at clinics. It may also help the instructors to develop their own sense of professional responsibility.

While differences in interpretation of key terms may be due to the absence of reflective deliberation with colleagues, it may also be a result of differences in values, orientations and aspirations among the instructors. When enacting deliberative communication, different opinions and values should be set against each other and challenged (Englund, 2006). Among the instructors, supported by the AD, there was more elaboration than confrontation about the language use. Affirming different voices is important from a pedagogical and a deliberative perspective, conflicts or confrontations of different views and values are substantial and central to deliberative communication. However, in Chapter 3, Englund and Bergh argue that situations with small differences in perspectives and values also have potential for deliberative communication when there is a possibility for learning and developing from what these differences imply. Situations of conflicts and confrontations form a continuum ranging from small differences to more obvious disagreements or conflicts. The differences in language use among the instructors were relatively small, while, nevertheless, implying potential to learn from and develop an understanding of the differences.

Deliberative communication praxis: the (possible) contribution of teachable moments

During the group meetings, there were times when the AD asked the instructors critical questions regarding the use of language while simultaneously demonstrating the importance of being inclusive and supportive of different voices; another important dimension of deliberative communication. While this seemed to work well, it is legitimate to ask: was there potential for stronger controversies, confrontations and conflicts that the AD could have used to challenge the academics' perspectives, values and aspirations related to the assessment of students' professional responsibility in clinical situations? For example, at one of the group meetings, an instructor asked another more experienced colleague about what to do with students who insist on behaving in a certain way and who ignore instructors' advice. The experienced instructor answered:

> Well, I think differently here. I don't know what the pedagogue says about it, but I, well, of course, I understand that there is one supervisor and one to be supervised, and I understand that there is a resistance to be supervised. But it depends on how you, as a supervisor, cope with it. There is a need to use different approaches in the supervision of different students.

When the instructor addressed the AD this way, it may be interpreted in a dual way. One interpretation is that he wanted to mark a certain professional distance by calling her "the pedagogue". This might suggests a kind of scepticism to whether the pedagogue fully understand the clinical settings in which they supervise. Another interpretation may be that he actually challenged the pedagogue to be more concrete on her opinion. However, it is less interesting what the instructor actually meant. What *is* evident is that the AD did not respond directly to this statement.

The role of AD often implies being a pedagogical expert in a context in which disciplinary knowledge reigns supreme; thus, an AD's situation is contingent (Sugrue et al., 2017). There was a potential in this situation to solicit different opinions, conflicting views and values to engage in a deliberative discussion of subject positions, authority, legitimacy, power and relations. In other words, this situation can be described as a teachable moment (Woods & Jeffrey, 1996): a moment in which a teacher has a fleeting, unplanned opportunity to offer insight to the students. However, by not acting in this situation the AD did not make use of a teachable moment that could have been exploited for opening up for deliberative communication.

Enacting deliberative communication is challenging. When the AD in the post-conversation, with the critical friends, reflected on this situation she explained that she was careful not to intrude into the role of the supervisor who was in charge of leading the meetings. She wanted to be a partner in the collaboration, not simply the expert in developing formative assessment procedures to nurture students' development as professionally responsible dentists. For this reason, she refrained from intervening too much in the participants' discussions in the group meetings.

These considerations exemplify the web of commitments ADs navigate: in this case, justifying their own legitimacy while focusing on the development of a formative assessment template of students' professional responsibilities; and the possibility of discussing subject positions, authority, legitimacy, power and relations. This shows that such normative theoretical ideals as deliberative communication are not fully reflected in practice; rather, they are goals for which to strive in order to reach legitimate comprises in the work of academic development. However, as Rowland (2007, p. 9) argued, the uncertainties in the work of an AD should be celebrated "in an environment that needs to give more space for doubt, contestation and deliberation".

Deliberative communication: legitimate compromise between the roles of expert and equal partner

In this case, the AD and the supervisor worked closely together in leading the process of instructors developing a formative assessment template. The AD had encouraged the supervisor to use deliberative communication as a pedagogy but did not challenge or push her to deploy it in the group meetings with the instructors. Their relationship was friendly and relaxed, and the two appeared to be friends, another benefit that had accrued over time, strengthening relationships, mutuality and trust. Before the first group meeting with the instructors, they discussed their roles and responsibilities and agreed that the supervisor, together with the instructors, should lead the work on the development of the template. However, the supervisor made clear that she wanted the AD to take an active part in the discussions at the group meetings, as the AD had competences they needed for their work. The videos from the group meetings clearly showed that the supervisor took the lead at the group meetings, while the AD sat back and listened. In some discussions, however, the AD took a more active role by framing the discussions and raising critical questions. On a few occasions, the supervisor approached the AD directly. For example, in one meeting, the supervisor asked the instructors about the usefulness of a draft of the assessment template that had been used with students during their clinics. When nobody answered, the supervisor looked at the AD and said: "Now you have to say something." It seemed she needed support to engage the instructors in the discussion and she reached for the safety net of calling on the expert. Significantly, the AD responded by first commenting on her own role (i.e. the more active role she and the supervisor had discussed), then pointed at one instructor and asked her about her experiences with using the template. This launched the group conversation. It also demonstrated the possibility that the presence of the pedagogical expert inhibited the supervisor, thus the AD was being careful, while cast in the role of expert, not to undermine the position of the supervisor as group leader - another subtlety of praxis.

The AD has a background as a pedagogue, and she has worked as a leader in different settings for many years. Within the Faculty of Dentistry, the field of science has very different epistemologies and ontologies in comparison with the social science. The AD has very limited disciplinary knowledge in dentistry, but she has expert competence in developing the instructors' understanding of professional responsibility, and she seemed to contribute to the interpretation of the "suitability regulations" to practice and their re-construction into praxis

in clinical situations. In the final meeting between the supervisor and the AD in April 2018, the supervisor emphasised that she saw the AD as the expert:

> You are contributing with another language, with another subject—to have you together with me at the meetings made me feel safer in the work with the instructors. The whole process has been very good. Your contribution has been connected to a subject - to science. It's not only talking and feeling; it is more substantial.

The expertise of the AD provided a safety net for the supervisor, but without the AD reflexively staying "out of the way", it is possible that the supervisor becomes dependent on the expertise rather than moving towards building her own deliberative communication competence. Nevertheless, these teachable moments serve as timely reminders that sophisticated praxis takes time, effort and expertise to become accomplished, and it is a never-ending process, far removed from a 'tricks for teachers' mindset.

The supervisor underlined the importance for the process of the AD's contributions as a representative from another scientific science. She acknowledged the AD's authority and legitimacy based on the AD's professional role and expert knowledge. However, these acknowledgements seemed more related to the AD's leadership role and her expertise in professional responsibility than to her contributions to attempts at deliberative communication in the meetings. In their final meeting after the last group meeting, the AD asked the supervisor what she thought about deliberative communication and how she had experienced it. The supervisor answered:

> It is sometimes so many words when you read about the idea of deliberative communication and the five principles, but at the same time, it looks very logical. But I had not heard about it before. I mean, it is not part of my disciplinary background. Still, I had a clear idea how to do it, but… Well, in the group meetings, there are so many things to remember and to be aware of when you are there. This deliberative communication is a new approach for me. I like to have control here. I have to admit that sometimes I felt that I had no control.

The above quote suggests that, in the work of developing the assessment template together with the instructors, the supervisor did not focus primarily on deliberative communication. Instead, she sought to manage and address the many other processes involved. It may also be the case that for more expert users of deliberative communication, it becomes an invisible element of the pedagogical fabric, while for novice users more immediate aspects of the teaching-learning situation make it difficult to reach the principles of deliberative communication with an appropriate degree of fluency. Deliberative praxis, while a work in progress that may be assisted by the active contribution of a pedagogical expert, is also a

delicate flower in the web of commitments such relationships inhabit, where finding legitimate compromise between expert and partner is uncertain, altering from moment to moment, yet crucially significant for the cultivation and enhancement of praxis.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, we have reported on a case study of one AD who collaborated with an educational leader at the Faculty of Dentistry to improve the clinical supervision and assessment of dental students. The AD articulated a clear aspiration to lead the process by using deliberative communication as a pedagogical approach to academic development. Deliberative communication was used as an endeavour for intellectual work: to build a mutual understanding of how to assess students' professional responsibility in clinical work. Sutherland (2018) argues that academic development must relate to a broader perspective than simply enhancing individual academics in their teaching, implying a focus on the purposes of teaching and a broadened discussion about higher education in relation to public good. The AD exemplified this perspective throughout the case by asking the supervisor and the instructors questions about how to define a professionally responsible dentist and by encouraging discussions about how to assess professional responsibility.

In this case, three different topics describe the different possibilities and challenges the AD faced when using deliberative communication as, and for, public good. First, one potential that arose with the use of deliberative communication seemed to be an increased awareness among the instructors of the use of language and the development of a more professional language regarding the supervision and assessment of students. A shared language can help build a community of practice related to teaching and supervising in clinics, which might, in turn, provide a gateway to a deeper professional understanding, thereby strengthening instructors' professional role as supervisors for students in clinical settings.

Second, it can be challenging to use deliberative communication when conflicts are evident. This is a paradox, as conflicts and confrontation are "substantially central to, and constitutive of, deliberative communication as a procedural phenomenon" (Englund, 2006, p. 513). ADs operate in a web of commitment and must take into consideration different disciplines and professions when searching for a legitimate compromise. How to enact deliberative communication will depend on the context. The AD observed in this case study had legitimacy at the Faculty of Dentistry after several years of collaboration, but still she can be

challenged to develop her own repertoire to exploit the possibilities in conflicts and confrontations when working with academics.

The third topic that arose in the case concerned the AD's leadership role. She continuously had to negotiate with herself how to navigate between providing the academics with expertise about professional responsibility, teaching and learning with being an equal partner working together with them to develop more professional assessment and supervision. Being an AD implies being an expert on processes that enhance teaching and learning. Nevertheless, being an expert does not mean that ADs tell people what to do; instead, being a professional AD seems to be about facilitating processes in which the participants (here, the supervisor and the instructors) take ownership of the development and define what is important for them. The AD in the case engaged in an adaptive, collaborative partnership with the supervisor and, to a certain extent, the instructors, to influence and develop educational practice. The supervisor underlined that the initiative at the Faculty of Dentistry would not have had the same quality without the AD's contribution.

This leads us to a final and summarising question: namely, what different qualities the AD, in this studied case, has contributed with? Here, we agree with Kandlbinder (2007) who has argued that academic development practices might be rethought in terms of the processes of deliberation. By following this experienced AD, who clearly stated that she believes in deliberative communication as, and for, public good, we have contributed empirical knowledge by putting the light on possibilities as well as challenges that emerged as the AD sought to lead the process by supporting the supervisor in her leadership of the group of instructors. Aspiring to use deliberative communication means being aware of the relationships and communications among those with whom you are working. It is about listening, deliberating, seeking arguments and valuing openness when different opinions and values are set against one another. In this case, this has been tried out in the process of reaching a legitimate compromise on a common template for assessing student dentists, suitability for becoming responsible dentists. Enabling the participants and supervisors to make nuances judgements and decisions consistent with this suitable assessment regulation can be seen as an encouragement of public good in the process of challenging, recalibrating and seeking legitimate compromises between competing perspectives, values and aspirations in higher education. Based on the analysis, we conclude that the commitment to try out the principles of deliberative communication enabled both the AD and the supervisor contribute to making the process a public good for the instructors, while also becoming more aware of

their own praxis. However, to what extent the template as a pedagogical tool actually will encourage a more coherent and predictable practice, in the work with students, is an empirical questions that needs to be further studied.

References

Alvesson, M., & Skölberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive Methodology*. London: Sage Publications.

Beck, E.E, Solbrekke, T.D., Sutphen, M. & Fremstad, E. (2015). When mere knowledge is not enough: the potential of bildung as self-determination, co-determination and solidarity. *Higher Education Research & Development 34(3),* 445-457. doi:10.1080/07294360.2014.973373

Brevik, L. M., Fosse, B. O., & Rødnes, K. A. (2014). Language, learning, and teacher professionalism: an investigation of specialized language use among pupils, teachers, and student teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *68*, 46–55.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Sullivan, W.M., & Dolle, J.R. (2011). *Rethinking Undergraduate Business Education: Liberal Learning for the Profession*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Debowski, S. (2014). From agents of change to partners in arms: the emerging academic developer role. *International Journal for Academic Development, 19*(1), 50–56.

Englund, T. (2006). Deliberative communication: a pragmatist proposal. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *38*(5), 503–520.

Fremstad, E., Bergh, A., Solbrekke, T. D., & Fossland, T. (2019). Deliberative academic development: the potential and challenge of agency. *International Journal for Academic Development.* doi:10.1080/1360144X.2019.1631169

Handal, G., Lycke, K. H, Mårtensson, K., Roxå, T., Skodvin, A., & Solbrekke, T. D. (2014). The role of academic developers in transforming Bologna regulations to a national and institutional context, *International Journal for Academic Development*, *19*(19), 12–25.

Kandlbinder, P. (2007). The challenge of deliberation for academic developers. *International Journal of Academic Development*, *12*(1), 55–59.

Norwegian Government (2006) *Forskrift om skikkethetsvurdering i høyere utdanning [Regulation on suitability assessment in higher education]* https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/2006-06-30-859 (downloaded 8 August 2019).

May, L. (1996). *The socially responsive self. Social theory and professional ethic*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Rowland, S. (2007). Academic development: a site of creative doubt and contestation, *International Journal for Academic Development*, *12*(1), 9–14.

Schon, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Sage Publications.

Solbrekke, T. D. (2007). *Understanding conceptions of professional responsibility* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oslo, Oslo.

Solbrekke, T. D. (2008). Professional responsibility as legitimate compromises—from communities of education to communities of work. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(4), 485–500.

Solbrekke, T.D., & Englund, T. (2011). Bringing professional responsibility back in. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(7), 847–861.

Solbrekke, T. D., & Fremstad, E. (2018). Universitets—og høgskolepedagogers profesjonelle ansvar [Academic developers' professional responsibility]. *Uniped*, *3(*41), 2018.

Solbrekke, T. D. & Sugrue, C. (2014). Professional accreditation of initial teacher education programmes: teacher educators' strategies—between 'accountability' and 'professional responsibility'? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *37*, 11—20.

Stensaker, B. (2018). Academic development as cultural work: responding to the organizational complexity of modern higher education institutions. *International Journal for Academic Development, 23*(*4*), 274–285

Stensaker, B., van der Vaart, R., Solbrekk, T. D., & Wittek, L. (2017). The expansion of academic development: the challenges of organizational coordination and collaboration. In: B. Stensaker, G. Bilbow, L. Breslow, & R. Van der Vaart (eds.), *Strengthening Teaching and Learning in Research Universities: Strategies and Initiatives for Institutional Change* (19–42)*.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sugrue, C., Englund, T., Solbrekke, T. D. & Fossland, T. (2017). Trends in the practices of academic developers: trajectories of higher education? *Studies in Higher Education,* 43(12), 2336-2353.

Sullivan, W. M., & Rosin, M. S. (2008). *A New Agenda for Higher Education. Shaping a Life of the Mind for Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sutherland, K. A. (2018). Holistic academic development: is it time to think more broadly about academic development project? *International Journal for Academic Development*, *23*(*4*), 261–273.

Taylor, K. L. (2005). Academic development as institutional leadership: an interplay of person, role, strategy, and institution, *International Journal for Academic Development*, 10(1), 31-46.

Tjora, A. (2010). *Kvalitative forskningsmetoder i praksis [Quality research methods in practice]*. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.

Walker, M. (2018). Dimensions of higher education and the public good in South Africa. *Higher Education, 76(3),* 555-569. doi:10.1007/s10734-017-0225-y

Wertsch, J. (1991). *Voices of the Mind: A Sociocultural Approach to Mediated Action*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Woods, P. and Jeffrey, B. (1996). *Teachable Moments: The Art of Teaching in Primary Schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Youngs, H. (2017). A critical exploration of distributed leadership in higher education: developing an alternative ontology through leadership-as-practice. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 39*(2), 140-154.

i See Chapter 4 for more examples on how ADs may cope and lead within webs of commitments.

ii The criteria to be used when assessing the suitability of a student for the study programmes in health education are:

a) the student shows a lack of willingness or ability for care, understanding and respect for patients, clients or users;

b) the student shows a lack of willingness or ability to cooperate and to establish relationships of trust and communicate with patients, clients, relatives and collaboration partners;

c) the student shows threatening or offensive behaviour in the context of their studies;

d) the student abuses substances or acquires medicines illegally;

e) the student has problems of a nature that seriously compromises his/her functions towards his/her surroundings,

f) the student shows too little self-insight regarding tasks in his/her studies and his/her future professional role;

g) the student shows negligence and commits irresponsible actions that may entail risks for patients, clients or user;

h) the student shows a lack of willingness or ability to change unacceptable behavioUr in accordance with guidance.

https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/kd/vedlegg/uh/forskrifter/regulation_suitability_higher_education.pdf

iii This course has been led and developed by the AD and another AD in close collaboration with two educational leaders at the Faculty of Dentistry since 2012. The main aim of this course is to qualify newly appointed instructors in supervising and evaluating students in clinical work. The group working with developing a template for use in evaluation of students in clinical work, is part of the obligatory course assignments. The course ran over three days: a two-day seminar in September 2017, and one-day seminar in January 2018. There are 25 participants and they are divided into five groups to do development work on different themes between the two seminars. In this case we focus on the group working with developing a new evaluation template.

iv In Kandlbinder's definition (2007) this means that academic developers should facilitate processes that critically discuss how university teaching may encourage critical thinking and consciousness of academics' responsibilities.

v See Chapter 4 for an elaboration of 'responsibility' and 'accountability' logics and the embedded tensions between these.

Table 10.1 Methods and data sources

Time	What took place	Types of data sources	Who participated	Use for analytical purposes
Spring 2017	Planning	Planning document	AD	As preparation for the first conversation between the AD and the two critical friends
August 2017	Conversation about the purpose of the project and reflections on the AD's values and aspirations and how to enact deliberative communication.	Video	AD and critical friends	To get an overview of the AD's intentions and plans on how to carry them through
Fall 2017 Four meetings	Discussion of the concept of "professional responsibility" and introduction of deliberative communication as a pedagogical approach. Clarification of the roles and responsibilities of the AD and the supervisor in the upcoming group meetings with the instructors.	Video	AD and supervisor	To identify possibilities and challenges by using deliberative communication as a means to explore the role of the AD in relation to the role of the supervisor
Fall 2017: Four group meetings	Work with and discussions about assessment templates in relation to the guidance of dental students in clinics. Both the AD and the supervisor intend to use deliberative communication as a means.	AD's log and video	AD, supervisor and instructors	To identify possibilities and challenges using deliberative communication To explore the AD's leadership in practice
April 2018: A meeting following the completion of all group meetings	Reflection on what has been learnt concerning the development of an assessment template for professional responsibility and the use of deliberative communication.	Video	AD and supervisor	To identify possibilities and challenges using deliberative communication To explore the role of the AD in relation to the role of the supervisor
May 2018	Conversation about what the researchers observed in	Notes and video	AD and critical	To explore the AD's reflections on her

	the empirical material and the AD's experiences from the case, including the meetings with the supervisor, the group of instructors and the critical friends		friends/ researchers	enactment of deliberative communication when faced with videos and researchers' observations and questions To explore the possibilities and challenges inherent in deliberative leadership